

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 were pending. Claims 1-10 and 12 were rejected and Claim 11 objected to. Claims 1-2, 5 and 10-12 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the Specification as filed at least in paragraphs [0038], [0048] and FIGS. 2A and 2B. No new matter has been added. Thus, after entry of this amendment, Claims 1-12 are currently pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Preliminary, Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that dependent Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 was rejected because it claimed “storing the image signals, however there are three sets of signals (first, second and modified) and it is unclear as to which are being stored” (Office Action, page 2). Claim 2 is amended to recite, in part, “a memory unit storing the first image signals or the second image signals.”

Claim 7 was rejected because “it is unclear how the multiplexer is changing the path of the signals going to the memory, when the signals are already stored in the memory” (Office Action, page 2). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Although in general

a multiplexer operates with multiple inputs and one output, a multiplexer may operate with multiple outputs and one input. As stated, for example, in the Specification, with respect to FIG. 9, “the multiplexer 650 determines output path of a signal in response to a control signal CS” (Specification, [0145]).

As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Greier (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0149598), herein referred to as “Greier.”

Of the above-referenced claims, Claims 1 and 12 are independent. Accordingly, once allowability of these claims is established, all claims depending therefrom are likewise allowable.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part “wherein each pixel includes first and second subpixels, and wherein the pixels include upper and lower pixels adjacent to each other, the second subpixel of the upper pixel is capacitively coupled with the first subpixel of the lower pixel” (emphasis added). Claim 12, as amended, recites in part “wherein each pixel includes first and second subpixels, and wherein the plurality of pixels include upper and lower pixels adjacent to each other, the second subpixel of the upper pixel is capacitively coupled with the first subpixel of the lower pixel” (emphasis added).

In rejection the previous Claim 10, which recited “the first and the second subpixels are capacitively coupled with adjacent subpixels,” the Office Action cites Grier paragraph [0009], and states that it “uses capacitive coupling between subpixels to improve viewing

angle.” Greier only discloses however, “each subpixel is divided into two smaller split subpixels. An additional storage capacitor is utilized in combination with different load capacitances of the two split subpixels to provide a different pixel voltage to the two split subpixels” (emphasis added) (Greier, [0009]). Greier does not disclose that “pixels include upper and lower pixels adjacent to each other” and “each pixel includes a first and second subpixels” where “the second subpixel of the upper pixel” is “capacitively coupled with the first subpixel of the lower pixel” as recited in Claims 1 and 12.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit independent Claims 1 and 12, and all claims depending therefrom are patentable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Greier in view of Lee (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0180676), herein referred to as “Lee.”

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Greier in view of Terashima (U.S. Patent No. 7,023,413), herein referred to as “Terashima.”

The above-referenced claims depend on independent Claim 1. Accordingly, once allowability of that claim is established, all claims depending therefrom are likewise allowable.

As discussed above, Lee does not disclose, nor does Lee suggest “wherein each pixel includes first and second subpixels, and wherein the pixels include upper and lower pixels adjacent to each other, the second subpixel of the upper pixel is capacitively coupled with

the first subpixel of the lower pixel” as recited in Claim 1. Neither Lee nor Terashima correct this defect.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit independent Claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom are patentable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the remarks set forth above, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Authorization is given to charge any fees due or credit any overpayments in regard to this communication to deposit account 50-5029. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at (408) 331-1672 is welcomed and encouraged.

Certification of Electronic Transmission

Certificate of Transmission: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's EFS-Web electronic system on:

July 15, 2010

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signe Holmbeck

/Signe Holmbeck/

Respectfully submitted,

/Signe Holmbeck/

Signe Holmbeck
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 46,484

Innovation Counsel LLP

21771 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 200

Cupertino, California 95014

Direct: (408) 331-1674

Telephone: (408) 331-1670

Facsimile: (408) 725-8263

E-mail: sholmbeck@innovationcounsel.com